REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-15 and 17-22 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19-22 have been amended, and Claim 16 has been cancelled, herewith. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

I. Double Patenting

Claims 1-22 stand rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In rejecting Claims 1-22, the Examiner states that in the instant case, all elements of Claims 1-22 correspond to Claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262, except that in the instant claims the element "heterogeneous registries" is referred to in the patent claims as "list of servers". Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, all claimed elements except the heterogeneous registries are not identical with the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262. As but one example, Claim 1 in the instant case recites "a routing program executed by said processor, said routing program being connected to receive a user name, a user password, and a domain name associated with the user and to route requests for authorization according to said domain name". The patent claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262 do not recite a routing program that receives a user name, a user password, and a domain name associated with the user, nor do the patent claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262 recite a routing program that routes requests for authorization according to said domain name. The cited reference makes no mention in the claims whatsoever of any use of a *domain name*, or the *routing of requests for authorization according to such missing domain name*. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, all elements of Claims 1-22 except the element "heterogeneous registries" do not correspond to Claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262, and thus these claims have been improperly rejected on the ground of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-43 of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262.

II. Objection to Claims

Claim 4 was objected to as containing a typographical error. Applicants have amended such claim as requested by the Examiner.

Therefore, the objection to the claims has been overcome.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Guo et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,912,582). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Generally speaking, the present claims are directed to techniques that facilitate a *distributed* user authentication mechanism such that multiple, preexisting authentication registries can continue to be used when a particular computer environment is augmented or upgraded to provide additional servers with their associated authentication requirements (Specification page 4, lines 5-9; page 5, lines 2-10; page 10, line 13 – page 12, line 12). The teachings of the cited Guo reference are fundamentally different – and in fact expressly teach away from such a distributed authentication mechanism. Specifically, Guo teaches a *centralized* authentication server and associated central database for such central authentication server (col. 4, lines 46-63; Figure 1, elements 110 and 112). For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Applicants will now show that every element recited in each of Claims 1-22 is not identically shown in the cited Guo reference, and therefore Claims 1-22 have been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Guo.

Claim 1 recites "a routing program executed by said processor, said routing program being connected to receive a user name, a user password, and a domain name associated with the user *and to route requests for authorization according to said domain name*". The cited Guo reference does not teach a routing program that routes requests for authorization according to said domain name. The cited reference makes no mention whatsoever of routing of requests for authorization according to such a domain name. In rejecting this aspect of Claim 1, the Examiner states that Guo teaches the particulars of the claimed routing program at Figure 1, item #100-112; Figure 4; Summary; Column 4, lines 25-63 and Column 8, line 55 – Column 10, line 32. Applicants urge that these cited passages make no mention of any routing of requests for authorization according to a domain name. Rather, these cited passage state that a client computer system posts user name and password to authentication server (col. 9, lines 39-46). There is no special routing associated with this authentication, and in particular there is no routing of a request for authentication according to a domain name associated with a user. Instead, *after authentication has been completed*, client computer system is redirected to an appropriate service. This can be seen by Guo's teaching at col. 8, lines 1-12, where it states:

> "As part of the user registration process, the user is assigned (or selects) a login ID, which is a common login ID, used to access any affiliate server (e.g., server 104, 106, 108). The login ID may also be referred to herein as a "user name" or "login name". Additionally, the user selects a password associated with the login ID that is used for authentication purposes. *After registering and logging into the authentication server, the user can visit any affiliate server* (i.e., affiliate servers that are also registered with the

same authentication server) without requiring any additional authentication and without re-entering user information that is already contained in the associated user profile."

This can also be seen by Guo's teaching at col. 9, lines 39-50, where it states:

> "A preferred embodiment of the invention, client computer system 100 communicates confidential information, such as the login ID and password, to authentication server 110 using a secure protocol (e.g., secure sockets layer (SSL)). Various other secure protocols or encryption mechanisms can be used to communicate confidential information between authentication server 110 and client computer system 100.
>
> **The client computer system 100 posts the user's credentials (e.g., user name/password) to authentication server 110 at 222. (See E). The authentication server 110 then validates the user name/password provided by the user at 226 and, if successful, looks up the desired web service location at 228 *before* redirecting client computer system 100 to the appropriate service** (e.g., Hotmail.RTM. e-mail service), attaching the rru carry through parameter, at 230. (See F). In other words, authentication server 110 retrieves the appropriate location information from authentication database 112 to identify the location of server 104, 106, or 108 providing the selected service."

Quite simply, per the teachings of Guo, the user is redirected to a requested service after authentication has already been completed. There is no teaching of any type of authentication request itself being specially routed (or redirected) as per the features of Claim 1. The special routing of the actual authentication request itself, per the features of Claim 1, advantageously allows for a *distributed authentication system* whereby a plurality of authentication registries can be used such that preexisting authentication registries can be easily incorporated into an existing system environment without requiring extensive changes to be made to the authentication infrastructure to support the newly added registries (Specification page 2, lines 11-14). In contrast, the teachings of the cited Guo reference are specifically directed to a *central authorization system* having a central database for authenticated all users at one location. For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. 102, *every element* of the claimed invention must be *identically shown* in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Thus, as every element recited in Claim 1 is not identically shown in a single reference, and in particular the cited reference does not teach routing of requests for authentication according to a

domain name associated with a user, it is urged that Claim 1 has been erroneously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Applicants initially traverse the rejection of Claims 2- 5 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 1 (of which Claims 2-5 depend upon).

Further with respect to Claim 4, such claim recites "wherein said routing program routes requests to one of a plurality of heterogeneous registries used to authenticate users of the computer system". As can be seen, the heterogeneous registries that the requests are routed to by the routing program are used to authenticate users of the computer system, and the routing of the requests to one of these registries further facilities the use of a distributed authentication scheme supporting a plurality of decentralized registries that can be used for such user authentication. In contrast, per the teachings of the cited Guo reference, a single centralized authentication server is used to provide authentication for all users in a central location (Guo col. 4, lines 46-63; Figure 1, elements 110 and 112). In rejecting Claim 4, the Examiner cites Guo's teaching at col. 4, lines 25-41 as teaching the claimed routing to a heterogeneous registry. Applicants urge that the redirection described by this cited Guo reference is that a user is redirected to a requested service *after authentication has already been completed* (Guo col. 8, lines 1-12). Because the user has already been authenticated, and the entire premise of Guo is to avoid duplicate login/authentication (Guo col. 2, lines 12-41) there would be no reason for Guo to route authentication requests to one of a plurality of heterogeneous registries, presumably the plurality of servers described by the cited Guo passage, as they have already been authenticated by a central authentication server when this server routing is done (as described in detail above). Thus, it is further urged that Claim 4 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

With respect to Claim 6, such claim recites "using said domain name to determine an access protocol and an access registry that is associated with said domain name" and "routing access queries from said user to said access registry using said access protocol". As can be seen, the domain name provided by the user is used to determine an access protocol, and this access protocol is used to route user access queries to an access registry. In rejecting Claim 6, the Examiner cites Guo's teachings at Figure 1, item #100-112; Figure 4; Summary; Column 4, lines 25-63 and Column 8, line 55 – Column 10, line 32 (i.e. the same cited passages that were used in the Claim 1 rejection). Applicants urge that these passages describe redirecting a user to a requested service after having been authenticated by a centralized authentication server, as previously detailed above. In contrast, per the features of Claim 6, a particular access protocol used to actually authenticate the user is determined based upon a user-provided domain name. The cited reference does not teach – and in fact expressly teaches away from – a decentralized authentication mechanism that is provided by these claimed features of Claim 6. Thus, it is urged that Claim 6 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 7-9 for reasons given above with respect to Claim 6 (of which Claims 7-9 depend upon).

With respect to Claim 10 (and dependent Claims 11 and 12), Applicants traverse the rejection of such claim for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 6.

With respect to Claim 13 (and dependent Claims 14 and 15), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claims 1 and 4.

With respect to Claim 17 (and dependent Claims 18-20), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 4.

With respect to Claim 21 (and dependent Claim 22), Applicants traverse for similar reasons to those given above with respect to Claim 17.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

IV. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited reference and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Wayne P. Bailey/

Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants